



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

CS

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,918	08/27/2003	Katsuhiko Miya	P/1250-258	5086
2352	7590	10/04/2007		
OSTROLENK FABER GERB & SOFFEN 1180 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 100368403			EXAMINER MACARTHUR, SYLVIA	
			ART UNIT 1792	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Art Unit: 1763

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 7/20/2007 have been fully considered. , but are unpersuasive. The arguments of on page 7 paragraph 2 regarding the prior art of Taniyama et al were discussed. Therein applicant argues that Taniyama et al fails to anticipate an atmosphere blocking member as it does not correspond in shape and size to holding rotating element. However, the terms corresponds does not positively recite that they are the same size, but that they correspond or are in agreement with each other and are parallel to, which is the case of Tanya. Also, that if applicant amends the claims to recite the shape of the blocking member, it has been held by the courts that the shape of an article or apparatus is a matter of choice which a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found obvious absent persuasive evidence that the particular shape was significant. In re Dailey, 357 F.2d 669, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1966). Applicant has failed to show criticality of this size and shape.

In the case of Tanya et al, Fig.3 illustrates that the blocking member 31 moves such that the blocking member is inherently capable of being arranged eccentrically to a center of the surface of the substrate. Furthermore, the outer gas discharge port formed on the blocking member is continuously and annularly enclosed the inner gas discharge port, see Figs. 6-8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1763

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanya et al (US 6,247,479).

Regarding claims 1, 20, and 21: Taniyama et al teaches a blocking member 31 with a plurality of nozzles 40-42, see Figs. 7-8 and 11. Cols. 9 lines 60- col. 10 lines 1-15 recite that the chemical solution is discharged from nozzle 40, water 41, gas 42, and nitrogen 44.

Regarding the limitation that the atmosphere blocking member correspond in shape and size to holding/rotating element.

Regarding claim 3, 6, 7, 10: See Figs. 7-8 and 11 of Taniyama et al.

Regarding claim 19: Taniyama teaches in col. 7 lines 58-67 that the blocking member rotates.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5, 8, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniyama et al.

Claim 4: Taniyama et al teaches the use of valves to control the flow of the treatment fluids (gas and liquids). The fluids are independently controlled and thus the delay of introducing the fluids is deemed obvious by the structure of Taniyama et al. The motivation to use the valves is

Art Unit: 1763

for enhanced independent control of the fluids. Thus, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to provide a delay of introducing fluids as desired by using the valves as valves allow for flow control.

Regarding claims 5, 8, and 9: Taniyama et al fails to teach the flow rate of the gas in the outer port is larger than the inner port. However, the gas flow rates are controlled by valves that can be adjusted to ensure an optimal level of gas is provided to ensure the desired product result. Where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation in the absence of a showing of criticality. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have determined the optimum values of the relevant process parameters such as the flow rate of the gas discharged from the inner and outer gas discharge ports.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,


Art Unit: 1763

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sylvia R. MacArthur whose telephone number is 571-272-1438. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th during the hours of 8 a.m. and 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Parviz Hassanzadeh can be reached on 571-272-1435. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Sylvia R. MacArthur
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1763

September 30, 2007